

SECRET

DDI NEWSLETTER

1 JUNE 1984

In Search of Excellence

Several days before the DCI's "Excellence" speech in the auditorium on March 16, I asked each Office and Staff to submit its suggestions for improvements that we might make on our own within the Directorate of Intelligence. I also met with the Directorate's Management Advisory Group and asked them to consult widely within the Directorate and provide me a paper with suggestions for improving the working environment in the Agency.

Once the Director had given his speech and announced his decisions, I asked [] Persian Gulf Division Chief in NESAs, to team up with several others in the Directorate representing different skills and levels and sort out from the many suggestions from the Offices those measures we could or should implement. The group included [] a branch chief in ALA; [] an analyst from EURA; [] an OSWR secretary and [] from PMS. 25X1 25X1 25X1

Now that I have the [] Committee report, the MAG report, and the Director's guidelines, I would like to set forth in one place changes in policy and approach to reduce bureaucratic barriers to excellence, to recognize excellence of performance, and to foster imagination, creativity, and better management at all levels. 25X1

I. Recognition and Reward

The DCI has delegated to me the authority to approve quality step increases, cash awards up to \$1,000, and awards up to and including the Career Intelligence Medal. In the past, recognition for an excellent performance has been too infrequent, given to too few people, and too long delayed.

- To recognize and reward more deserving people in the Directorate, I am delegating authority to Office Directors and Staff Chiefs to make cash awards up to \$500. Because there is not a significant amount of money remaining for FY-84, these awards will be reviewed until the end of this fiscal year by the ADDI to insure that no office is taking a disproportionate amount of available funds. Beginning on 1 October, 80% of our

SECRET

Cl By Signer
DECL OADR

SECRET

award funds will be distributed to the Offices and Staffs proportionately according to their size. The Office Director will then be able unilaterally to make awards up to \$500. I strongly encourage Office Directors to provide recognition for excellence to the large number of people in this Directorate who deserve it.

- Offices may nominate and I will approve, based on recommendation of the Career Service Board, awards in the amount of \$501 to \$1,000 as well as other awards including the Career Intelligence Medal. I will personally also select recipients of such awards.
- I welcome recommendations from Office Directors for quality step increases for sustained excellence and performance.
- I urge managers at the Office and Division level to bear in mind the range of non-cash awards that serve to focus attention and grant recognition for outstanding performance, for example, the Meritorious Unit Citation for a group of people who have excelled.
- With a little creativity and imagination, there are other ways to give recognition and special thanks for work well done. For example, inviting a secretary, IA, or support officer to join in a recruiting trip or in a conference seems to me perfectly legitimate. There must be other ways we can identify to recognize excellence. The point is that managers at all levels every day need to be on the look out for ways to reward particularly outstanding achievement and to show appreciation to the large number of people in this Directorate who are responsible for our performance and good reputation.

II. Réducing Bureaucracy/Delegating Downward

- The Director has delegated approval of SIS-1 and 2 assignments to me. Once I have approved them verbally, the only required paperwork will be the personnel action.
- From now on, we will issue Directorate-wide notices for SIS-01/2 vacancies.
- Annual Work Plans henceforth are optional.
- Career panels will no longer require separate documentation for promotion recommendations.
- Time-in-grade guidelines for promotion will continue to be waived selectively to reward excellence in performance.

SECRET

SECRET

- Two notebooks containing all Vacancy Notices for the Directorate and all Agency-wide notices will be placed in the Library.
- The monthly report on production statistics required for the Product Evaluation Staff is eliminated effective immediately.
- The annual requirement to prepare the Senior Officer Development Plan is eliminated.
- As set forth in Headquarters Notice of 11 May, office directors are authorized to spend up to \$1,000 for supplies and equipment.
- Authority to determine whether academic courses, conferences or seminars meet the two year training and education requirement I established henceforth will rest with the branch chief rather than the office director. Each office should provide the branch chiefs with guidelines to appropriate standards.
- Approval of Agency-sponsored attendance at professional conferences is delegated to the Office Directors. Offices must keep a record of such approvals. Participation in panels, presentation of papers and other such involvement in conference programs must still be approved by the ADDI.
- Authority to approve participation in Agency non-quota training courses (such as language courses) will reside with the branch chief. The branch chief also will now have the authority to give Directorate approval for Agency sponsored academic course work, although OTE approval must still be obtained.
- The requirement for reporting on the quarterly review of destruction of files is eliminated, but I urge everyone to try to reduce files, if for no other reason than to give us a little more space.
- Office directors are encouraged to be more aggressive and creative about training opportunities for secretaries and intelligence assistants. Directorate of Intelligence authority to approve non-CIA training opportunities or non-quota CIA training courses will rest with the office directors.
- From now on, secretaries will be included in all Directorate teams for recruiting secretaries and clericals; we will encourage the Office of Personnel to follow suit.

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

- Henceforth, this Directorate will seek to place secretaries as appropriate at the division level and above in the the Professional Woman's Course; we will sponsor secretaries at the Office level and above for the Urban Awareness Course.
- Analysts and analyst support officers may be promoted up to GS-11 at any time during the year. Such promotions will be contingent on available headroom and overall office average grade level. Career Service Panels will continue to evaluate and rank all analysts at each grade level at least semi-annually.
- The Director has abolished the eight-hour donation rule on directed overtime for GS-12 through GS-15 employees. No DI professional should expect compensation for all after hours work; the nature of our business often calls for extra effort in the timely completion of assigned work or in responding to fast moving events that should be viewed as a natural result of our professional obligations. Directed overtime applies to those instances -- such as weekend duty, task forces, short-fuse papers -- whereby the demands on employee time go beyond the norm for DI professionals. Authority to approve overtime resides within the individual Offices or Staffs.
- Shorthand is abolished as a blanket prerequisite for senior secretarial assignments, but those with shorthand and other specialized skills will obviously be more competitive.
- New analysts now participate in the New Analyst Course for a six week orientation to CIA and the DI. A new employee orientation checklist will be developed for all other new DI people. Each office also should appoint a "mentor" for each new employee to ease adjustment to and integration into the DI.

III. The Review Process

There is probably no aspect of this directorate's work that is as great a symbol of bureaucracy, management overreaction to the next higher level and the difficulty of carrying out analysts' substantive responsibilities than product review. I say symbolic because these obstacles are often far greater in myth than in reality. Many analysts have had complex papers sail through this process virtually untouched in a very short time. Moreover, as I explained in my last newsletter, the review process has many purposes, only one of which is to critique the work of the analyst.

SECRET

SECRET

The symbolism is both positive and negative. On the positive side, the review process is a manifestation of the priority we attach to the substance of our work from the most senior people in the directorate to the most junior. It also, for all of the aggravation, is the means by which the substantive view of a single individual becomes the position of a powerful institution with all of the support that suggests. On the negative side, some analysts regard it as an expression of a lack of confidence but most importantly simply as a grueling and draining experience.

I believe that it is my duty and obligation to review the substantive product in draft. It is, for me, at the heart of the effort to focus our energies on the substantive product and to improve the quality of our work. That said, I am prepared to take some steps in an effort to ease the perceived burden. To this end:

- Henceforth, I will review only the key judgments or executive summaries of all Research Papers and Technical Information Reports. Typescripts prepared for consumers at the deputy assistant secretary level and below may be disseminated on the approval of the office director. I will continue to review the full text of Intelligence Assessments and typescripts for higher level customers. Even though I will continue to look at all IAs, I will read them in depth more selectively. (This new approach implies no derogation of RPs or TIRs; just recognition that they often are not directly policy oriented nor addressed to the senior policy level.)
- Within the offices, I strongly encourage experimentation with alternative approaches to the review process. Two such approaches are as follows:
 - One approach would be for the division chief, if he or she decides a paper is essentially sound, to assemble a panel comprising one representative of each review layer in the office (the branch chief, the division chief, the office director or deputy, and perhaps one or two others with something special to contribute). Members would all have read the paper carefully, making marginal comments and suggestions. The panel would then meet with the analyst to discuss important points and return to the analyst at that time their copies of the paper with editorial and other suggestions. The next version of the paper would then go simultaneously to the branch and division chiefs and, if they approve, directly to me with a drop copy to the office director. The objective would be to reduce the amount of time involved in the review process, to put all of the reviewers in the office in the room

SECRET

SECRET

at the same time so that an analyst is not, as I described in the last newsletter, driven from pillar to post trying to satisfy contradictory guidance.

- Another approach would be to have comments on strong papers sent up the line on the same copy of the draft so that reviewers through the office director will be able to see, review and comment not only on the draft but on other reviewers' comments. Papers could then return to the analyst just one time for revision before coming to me. The objective would be to review conflicts among different reviewers and force the chain of command to resolve such conflicts without the analyst having to try to satisfy everyone.
- Henceforth, I would hope that questions about my comments on papers come directly to me from the analyst or branch chief. I encourage such questions.
- I continue to be open to other suggestions for simplifying the review process and making it less burdensome to the analyst while still achieving the substantive benefit.
- I urge the office directors to think creatively about the use of office level publications and informal ways of getting information to regular policy consumers in a timely and useful way. I hear all too often from analysts that the office level publications have become too formalistic and that the process of getting something approved for publication in them is as complicated as for a directorate level publication. The office journals offer an opportunity for newer analysts to have the opportunity to write as well as for people to try out new ideas or concepts that may be difficult to coordinate on a directorate wide basis. I encourage the office directors to review their procedures for these publications to see if they can be made more accessible and offer analysts greater freedom in both style and substance. At the same time, I encourage office directors to make greater use of "spot reports", short typescripts and other ad hoc approaches to meeting the needs of the consumer. I believe we can use these opportunities more effectively without impinging on the formal research program and directorate level finished intelligence.

IV. Ideas That Will be Pursued

A number of suggestions have been made for ways to make life a little easier and reduce bureaucracy. I believe a number of these have great merit, even though their implementation would require action by other components, funds not now available, or a

SECRET

SECRET

change in Agency regulations. Nonetheless, I intend to pursue them. These include:

- Streamlined procedures for foreign and domestic travel.

25X1

- To assist in the development of a one-agency concept, the possibility of shorter rotational assignments in other directorates.
- Development of better physical fitness facilities. OMS is already making alterations in the existing physical fitness room at headquarters. They are also working with Logistics for the installation of a 5,000 square foot physical fitness room in the new headquarters building. I have urged for some time construction of a jogging track inside the compound. I will continue to press this but it is possible that heavy truck traffic associated with construction of the new building may make this even more dangerous now than dodging BPR trucks outside the gates.
- Review of current regulations and procedures with a view to simplification and, where possible, elimination. This is already underway under the auspices of the DDA.
- I also will provide to the DDA the list of measures to improve our physical surroundings, as submitted to me by the Management Advisory Group.

Conclusion

If the "Excellence" effort is to have any significance or meaning, the philosophy that it represents--of getting high quality work done in the most efficient way possible under circumstances that encourage the recognition of superior performance and bring greater self-satisfaction--it must become a part of the daily life of the institution. If the exercise has shown anything, it is that people at all levels of this Agency have ideas about how to solve problems. All managers need to use imagination and creativity to tap these ideas and bring them to life. By the same token, I urge those at every level not to be content just to look for problems but to contribute ideas to the solutions as well. No one need wait for a manager to ask.

As for communication, which can always stand improvement, I intend to make these newsletters more frequent, and continue my weekly meetings with branch and division chiefs and with branches, and to meet monthly with the Directorate Management Advisory Group. Moreover, I encourage all of you to feel free to communicate directly to me or to any other manager your ideas on how we can make CIA and the Directorate of Intelligence in


SECRET

SECRET

particular a more productive and satisfying place to work. I encourage all directorate managers to make a part of their daily routine contact with the people in their offices and to listen to their ideas and concerns.

In CIA, and especially in this Directorate, our people are our most valuable asset. We must all look constantly for ways to improve the product, to make the work of our colleagues easier and more satisfying, and to recognize the skilled contributions of the professionals of all kinds in this Directorate. Exhortation is inadequate. Action--and action throughout the year--is the only way to give meaning to this effort and to build confidence that there is not a "we" and a "they" but only "us." The credo is a statement of aspirations; all of "us" now need to work to make it more of a reality. The measures I am announcing in this newsletter are a start.

25X1



Robert M. Gates
Deputy Director for Intelligence

Distribution B

SECRET

SECRET

DDI Newsletter

12 January 1984

Since the reorganization of October 1981, the Directorate has made considerable progress in improving the quality, timeliness and relevance of our analysis. One principal result has been a great upsurge in demand for CIA assessments and substantial enhancement of their importance and impact. Even so, we can't afford to rest on our laurels or become complacent. By our own standards, there is still room for improvement.

Rather than give another speech in the auditorium (for which we all probably are grateful), I thought it might be useful to devote a part of each newsletter to looking a little more closely at various elements of the effort to improve our product. This time around, I have focused on the review process for formal papers, quality versus quantity, the research program, and in-house training. I also have included some miscellaneous statistical information on the Directorate you might find of interest.

The Review Process

Several months ago, I asked the DI Management Advisory Group to survey analysts who had completed a major paper in the preceding year to see if we could identify ways to make the review process less onerous and less cumbersome. Several hundred analysts completed the long questionnaire. Because it addressed most of the problems that concern analysts -- excepting space -- I asked that a summary of the results be provided to every division in the Directorate (responding to one complaint that no one ever sees the results of these surveys). If you have not read it, I urge you to do so.

While the survey dispelled a few myths, it also indicated some problems on which we need to work. One purpose it served was to let me know that there were actually many more layers in the review process than I had either intended or think healthy. As a result, I have consulted with the Office Directors and told them that there should be no more than four substantive reviews to which an analyst need respond -- one each at the branch, division, office, and directorate level. Within the office, there should be only one editorial review.

This addresses only one aspect of the problem, however. My perception is that the heart of the issue is less how many reviewers there are than how much the analyst gets jerked

SECRET

C1 By Signer
DECL OADR

SECRET

around -- e.g., one reviewer saying take out detail and the next level saying put it back, or each reviewer having a different idea about how to deal with a particular aspect of the analysis or comments I might have and all dealing separately and often contradictorily with the analyst. The result is the analyst being driven from pillar to post trying to satisfy all the reviewers.

So, in addition to limiting the number of reviewers, the offices must better organize the process to avoid driving analysts up the wall. For example, in responding to my comments on a paper, the office director could either just have the analyst alone fix the problem or meet with the analyst and his or her supervisors to reach agreement together on how to respond. This would avoid the analyst having to make two or three tries until each supervisor separately is content. As the paper goes up the line, perhaps once the branch chief signs off, in more cases where a draft is in good shape the same copy could go to the division chief and then the office director so that the latter can see the text that the branch chief approved and changes proposed by the division chief. The office director could then judge these against his or her own comments and the draft would return but once to the analyst for fixes before coming to me. This might reduce the frustration of repeated revisions and new drafts as well as limit each reviewer sending the analyst in a different direction. It's a tough problem and the suggestions above may have shortcomings, but with some effort, ingenuity and common sense, we should be able to make the process less frustrating.

As we work on this problem it is worth remembering that the basic purpose of the review process is to take the individual ideas or judgments of a single analyst or a few analysts, and turn those ideas or judgments into the institutional position of the Central Intelligence Agency. As an individual, your ideas -- no matter how good or insightful -- count no more than those of tens of thousands of other individuals in various agencies working on international affairs. The review process, by testing your analysis and perhaps adding information and broader perspective, is the way in which your individual views become an institutional position.

It also ensures that the Directorate speaks with consistency across divisions and offices on similar issues. Your ideas are put in front of the President and the National Security Council as the institutional view of CIA, and that view carries enormous weight. And, while some of the words and the structure may change in review and coordination, the survey attests to the fact that in the overwhelming number of cases the ideas and analytic judgments and conclusions that emerge at the end of the review process are very similar, if not identical, to the ones the analyst first put on paper. Working in the Directorate of Intelligence gives you unique access both on paper and increasingly often in person to very senior people in the policy

SECRET

SECRET

agencies. The review process ensures that when you speak, you do so with the full backing and support of the Agency.

Production: Quality and Quantity

Production has increased to the point that it now stands at nearly the highest level in the Directorate's history. In fiscal year 1983 we published over 650 hardcover papers and more than 250 typescript memoranda disseminated to senior policymakers -- a 25 percent increase in production over FY-82. Moreover, these statistics do not include current intelligence, regional monthly publications, the Terrorist Review, the International Financial Situation Report, the IEEW and other such finished products.

The qualitative improvement in our work has been equally impressive. In particular, there has been a marked improvement in the rigor of our analysis and the willingness of DI analysts to address difficult analytical problems in an innovative and policy relevant way. Most importantly, this view is shared by our readers. On the assumption we can keep production up to current levels, I believe we should now concentrate our efforts more exclusively on further improvements in the quality of our analysis. I will return to this in subsequent newsletters but, for now, let me mention three areas where we can improve on present practice, both in current intelligence and in our research and policy support products:

- We are still too reliant on single outcome prognosis, a single "best-estimate" scenario. Too often, we simply provide the policymaker with additional data along with conventional wisdom. We need to devote more attention to identifying less likely alternative outcomes that would or could have major consequences for the United States. One paper that usefully did this was ALA's "Nigeria Under Civilian Rule: The Record and the Outlook" of July 1983.
- Our contacts with outsiders still tend to be too much with people who agree with us. Obviously, we want to be in touch with the authoritative experts in a given field, but we must also salt the mixture with some people with unorthodox and controversial ideas who will challenge our thinking, offer alternative perspectives and ensure that we are considering the full range of possibilities. We also need to have our papers reviewed by such people more often.
- We can bring more realism and "ground truth" to our work by better coordination of analyst foreign travel with research projects as well as by an improved dialogue with our overseas stations. Analyst travel plans and programs while abroad should anticipate forthcoming projects and be structured to take maximum advantage of opportunities to visit important sites, meet with locals

SECRET

SECRET

where feasible and agreeable to Embassy and station, and sit down with Embassy and station officers to benefit from their on-scene experience and expertise. Similarly, the analyst should be more energetic in developing, through the DO, a dialogue with the station to elicit its views, perspective, and local color, but also to provide specific requirements relating to on-going projects. The stations can often be very helpful on such requirements but they need to know what you need to know. And the better they understand your project, the more helpful they are likely to be.

Research Program

In recent weeks, many of you have been involved in completing the 1984 research program. The program, now in its third iteration, has become an integrated planning document that serves many purposes. It sketches out the work we plan to accomplish in the coming year and those areas we hope to investigate. It has become a vehicle for ensuring the integration of external analysis contracts into the Directorate's program as a whole. And it is a convenient vehicle for planning, levying collection requirements, organizing conferences associated with major themes in the program, and orchestrating contacts with outside specialists.

I regard the program as a valuable planning document and completion of the papers listed in it as a measure of progress on the research front. At the same time, when more important issues or problems arise, we should be willing to consider cancelling or postponing work in the research program that has become less relevant or less important than when the plan was originally put together. It would be the worst kind of "clientitis" if we became slaves to our own planning process.

Some Facts on the Directorate

In preparing for various budget hearings and drawing longer range plans, we have put together some statistics that may be of interest to you.

25X1

- When the Directorate fills the new positions authorized in the FY-84 budget, our strength will be At this time, we are aiming for an eventual ceiling of in 1987 -- about the analytical strength of the directorate twenty years ago.

25X1

- The Directorate is broken down in percentage terms along the following lines: Analysts - 39%; Analysis Support (ADP support, intelligence assistants, clericals, library and reference support, and so forth) - 32%; Managers - 15%; Administrative Personnel - 8%; people on rotations and training - 6%.

SECRET

SECRET

- Average age of DI personnel is 39; overall, 57% are male and 43% are female. Of DI analysts, 74% are male and 26% female.
- The overall FY-84 budget for the Directorate of Intelligence will be 40% larger than for FY-82. After many very lean years, we have a substantial increase in funds for travel and training in FY-84. At last, we can meet our basic needs in these areas.
- It is a young Directorate. 34% of the analysts are still in their probationary period; about half have fewer than five years experience and 73% have less than ten years experience.
- The average age of branch chiefs is 42, division chiefs 48, office directors 49.
- people are on rotational assignments and in full time academic training. 25X1
- A third of the entire directorate was promoted in FY-83. Approximately a third is promoted every year.
- Most analysts in the directorate are in grades 11-14. The percentage of analysts at each of those grades is: GS-14 -- 16%, GS-13 -- 26%, GS-12 -- 20%, GS-11 -- 11%. We also have GS-15 senior analysts and supergrade analysts.

Carrels

STAT

STAT

In my remarks to the Directorate in the auditorium a year ago, I mentioned that we would build some study carrels in the CIA Library for the use of DI analysts while working on projects. The intent was to gain some limited relief from the overcrowding and noise that has resulted from our unusually high rate of personnel growth in the last couple of years. I am happy to report that six of these carrels have been completed and are now available to you. OCR has sent a memorandum to all Directorate offices explaining how the carrels can be reserved and other ground rules.

Training

Over the last few months, the Directorate has been working with OT&E to design a series of courses to meet our specific needs. You should be aware of these new courses for managers, analysts and support:

- New Analyst Orientation: Last fall, OTE conducted a six-week pilot course designed to meet most of the initial training needs of new analysts who do not enter the Directorate through the Career Training Program.

SECRET

SECRET

The course provides orientation to the Intelligence Community, Agency, and Directorate, and it has major segments on producer-consumer relationships, collection systems, and analytical skills. It provides practice in writing the full range of intelligence products. This training will enable new analysts to begin producing finished intelligence soon after arrival on the job.

- Military Analysis: Two courses treating military analysis also have been developed. The first, a six-week Military Analysis Course, will provide a broad introduction to military forces with special attention to the kinds of substantive questions that analysts of foreign military capabilities often are called upon to answer. The second course, still in the planning and development phase, is entitled, "Military Analysis for Supervisors." The course is about one week in length and will be offered to supervisors who are not military specialists.
- Economic Analysis for Supervisors: Supervisors who want to increase their knowledge of economics and their skills in editing economic reports now have a three-day course available to them. This course will be offered twice a year. Many participants in the pilot running have reported that they now feel more confident when reviewing economic reports.
- Analysis Support: To provide Intelligence Assistants with the necessary background and skills, OTE has developed the "Analysis Support Course." This program is designed specifically for Intelligence Assistants who provide substantive support to the production of finished intelligence. Without exception, graduates have indicated that the training was beneficial. Most found that their skills in analysis and writing were significantly enhanced as a result of their participation in the course.
- SAFE: You are all aware of the rapid introduction of SAFE to the Directorate. We now have some 400 SAFE terminals and will be steadily adding more. To help prepare analysts, managers, and administrative support personnel, ODP has organized a SAFE User's Course which is training analysts almost as fast as their new equipment is being installed. I anticipate that the pace of training will nearly double and the Directorate will be training about forty people a month by early 1984.
- DI Contract Monitoring: We also are instituting a new three-day course for the Directorate's contract monitors. Considerably more analysts will be given duties as Contracting Officer's Technical

SECRET


SECRET

Representatives (COTR) as our budget for external analysis increases. This new course, which is patterned on the DDS&T's excellent program, will prepare our people to manage the purchase of analytical services with confidence and competence. The first running is planned for 30 January - 1 February.

- Clerical Support: A major step forward is OTE's resumption of training for clerical and secretarial personnel. Administrative support personnel now are brought on board and automatically placed in the two-week "Agency Orientation and Office Procedures" course. The course provides an overview of the Agency's mission and structure, and the skills, concepts, and operating procedures necessary to perform the job. I am pleased to note that the Directorate has graduated about forty students since the course began.

I believe we are moving in the right direction and now have available a variety of training programs within the Agency that directly or indirectly contribute to producing timely finished intelligence of high quality. I am especially pleased that these programs recognize the vital role played by the third of our people involved in analyst support. Without their contribution, we would be out of business.

25X1


Robert M. Gates
Deputy Director for Intelligence

Distribution B

7
SECRET